



# Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

*Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme*



## 31<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee

*Bonn, 28-29 September 2006*

---

CMS/StC31/Inf.2  
Agenda Item 3

### REPORTS OF THE 28<sup>TH</sup>, 29<sup>TH</sup> AND 30<sup>TH</sup> MEETINGS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE

*For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number, and will not be distributed at the meeting.  
Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copy to the meeting and not to request additional copies.*



# Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme



## Report of the 28th Meeting of the CMS Standing Committee

*Bonn, 21-22 April 2005*

### **Agenda Item 1: Opening remarks and introductions**

1. The meeting was opened by Mr Eric Blencowe (United Kingdom), Chair of the Standing Committee at 09:30 hrs on 21 April 2005. Mr. Blencowe observed that the key issues for discussion at the 28th meeting of the Standing Committee were resources, planning for the future, and planning for the Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP8). He thanked the German Government for having provided excellent facilities and interpretation services, and the Secretariat for preparing the meeting. He then welcomed all the participants (list at Annex 1).

2. Mr Dirk Schwenzfeier (Head of Division, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, representing the Host Government) welcomed participants on behalf of the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety. He remarked that three years after the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) the time had come to take stock of the 2010 Target and take decisions to further facilitate its achievement. The Target had given an enormous boost to worldwide efforts to protect and conserve biological diversity and it was now important to sustain and strengthen that momentum. He hoped that a forward-looking and ambitious Strategic Plan for 2006-2011 addressing areas of the 2010 Target for which CMS was responsible would be adopted by the 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP8) in November 2005 and subsequently implemented through the efforts of the Contracting Parties. The year 2010 was drawing ever closer and COP should send a clear signal that a tremendous effort was needed if a significant reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss was indeed to be achieved by that date.

3. Mr Robert Hepworth, CMS Executive Secretary, introduced new members of the CMS Secretariat who had joined the team since the last meeting of the Standing Committee including, at the professional level, Mr Francisco Rilla Manta, Information and Capacity-Building Officer, Mr Moulay Lahcen El Kabiri, Deputy Executive Secretary, and Ms Paola Deda, Inter-Agency Liaison Officer. He noted that the team was now larger and better balanced than it had ever been in the history of CMS.

### **Agenda Item 2: Confirmation of the Rules of Procedure (unchanged from 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting)**

4. The Chair invited the Committee to consider its Rules of Procedure (CMS/StC28/Inf.7), which were unchanged since the 27th Meeting. In the absence of any comments, the Rules of Procedure were confirmed.

### **Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the Agenda**

5. The Chair invited the Committee to consider the provisional agenda (CMS/StC28/1). Mr Hepworth suggested that consideration of the Report on CMS projects, scheduled as Agenda Item 6(c), would be better dealt with under Agenda Item 9, on account of the implications for resource allocation and priority setting. Agenda Item 9(a) was concerned with the current Strategic Plan (2000-2005) and not the future Strategic Plan (2006-2011) as stated. The issue of national reports had accidentally been omitted from the draft agenda and should be added as Agenda Item 10(d).

6. The agenda as amended was adopted (Annex 2).
7. Mr Hepworth proposed that Agenda Item 8(a) (Secretariat Manpower and Organizations) should be discussed in a closed session reserved for Contracting Parties participating in the meeting. On Agenda Item 8(d), he proposed that non-members of the Committee should be given a chance to hear and comment on the report of the Chair of the Budget Working Group in an open session, before the Committee went into closed session to complete its deliberations on the item. It was so agreed.

#### **Agenda Item 4: Adoption of reports of the 27th Meeting**

8. The review of progress on the follow-up from the 27th Meeting (CMS/StC28/4) produced in response to a request by the Committee at its 27th meeting had proved very useful and it was agreed that a similar table of action points should be produced by the Secretariat within a maximum of six weeks after the current meeting, in addition to the meeting report.
9. The Committee noted the report of its 27th Meeting.

#### **Agenda Item 5: Secretariat's report on CMS intersessional activities since the 27th Meeting**

10. Mr Hepworth proposed that members of the Secretariat would now each report on the activities in their own particular area of responsibility, assisted by a series of PowerPoint slides.
11. Launching the presentation, Mr Hepworth reported that some significant staff changes and changes in management approach had taken place. Since his own arrival at the end of August 2004 and the arrival of the Deputy Executive Secretary shortly afterwards, the staff of the Convention had achieved its full professional and administrative complement. Those improvements, which had required a major effort, were extremely important to improving the efficient operation of the Convention and the co-located agreements. The Secretariat now had a critical mass and, though still small, the team had the advantage of being flexible, creative and cohesive. He had striven from the beginning to foster good teamwork. Internal relations between the four secretariats had improved and the concept of the CMS family had been rebuilt. The pursuit of synergies between the multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) required that synergies first be achieved within the CMS family, and he called upon Contracting Parties to help to foster that process. Describing his own managerial style as proactive and supportive rather than risk-averse, he said his aim was to encourage individual responsibility within a framework of maximum transparency. He paid tribute to the work performed by Mr Lyle Glowka, Agreement Development and Servicing Officer, and Mr Marco Barbieri, Scientific and Technical Support Officer, who had borne so much of the workload when the Secretariat had been understaffed.
12. Mr El Kabiri (Deputy Executive Secretary) said that since joining the Secretariat in September 2004 he had been involved in human resource development as well as in the efforts to achieve sound and cost-effective administrative and financial management and to improve the image of the Secretariat among the Parties and other partners. The organigram had been revised to take account of objectives; for example, an External Relations and Media Unit had been created to reflect the desire to open up to the outside. There was also an Information and Capacity Building Unit in addition to the tried and tested Conservation and Implementation Unit. Work plans had been established and the objectives, which it was hoped would be derived from the Strategic Plan, would be allocated by unit. Staff performance evaluation was currently being carried out. Other areas of work currently included improving the existing system of financial management and ensuring best practice was applied in the follow-up to an audit in 2004. It was planned to move over to the Integrated Management Information System (IMIS), for which staff training would be required.

13. Ms Jasmin Kanza (Administrative and Fund Management Officer) stressed the rigorous process involved in human resource, financial and administrative management and the interaction required with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in Nairobi and other counterparts and implementing organizations. She drew attention to the new service level agreements, which essentially constituted a repackaging of the services previously provided by UNEP and UNON, in order to achieve transparency, highlight areas of responsibility and accountability and, above all, improve service delivery.

14. Mr Hepworth said that the 2010 Target was seen as a thread running through all the Secretariat's work for many reasons, notably the need to attract partners, especially co-funders, to help deliver on CMS objectives and to coordinate CMS's work with other MEAs. It was also a rallying point for the whole CMS family, and a way of attracting new parties to CMS and of demonstrating CMS's continued relevance as a long-standing convention in the context of sustainable development. He personally tried to ensure that all aspects of CMS's work were related to the 2010 target.

15. Mr Lyle Glowka (Agreement Development and Servicing Officer) recalled that the six existing Agreements and seven existing Memoranda of Understanding were serviced either individually within the CMS Secretariat or through working relationships developed with specialist organizations that provide coordination assistance or, as in the case of the Indian Ocean-Southeast Asia Marine Turtles MoU, through a special coordinator affiliated with the CMS Secretariat. Reporting on developments since the 27th Meeting of the Standing Committee, he said that the Fifth Meeting of the Range States of the Siberian Crane MoU in Moscow 2004 agreed on the need to establish a network of sites critical for Siberian Cranes of the Western and Central populations to promote protection of key wetlands and coordination among the Range State in the Central Asian Flyway. It also agreed with a proposal to introduce the site network concept into the next version of the respective MoU conservation plans.. A meeting to discuss the matter was due to take place in June 2005 in New Delhi to be hosted by the Indian Government. The First Meeting of the Signatories to the Great Bustard MoU, which met in Illmitz in September 2004 at the kind invitation of the Austrian Government and the National Park Neusiedler See, had generated several substantive outputs including the production of a synthetic overview report; agreement to expand the MoU area and to invite Italy, Serbia and the Russian Federation to consider joining. The Czech Republic was actively considering joining. An international conservation officer had been appointed in April 2004 to help coordinate the Aquatic Warbler MoU and launch some projects under the action plan. BirdLife International secured the position and obtained financing from Michael Otto Stiftung. One of the coordinator's first outputs had been the recent production of the Aquatic Warbler Flyway Newsletter. A DEFRA-sponsored project to identify Aquatic Warbler wintering areas was being finalized.

16. Turning to instruments under development, Mr Glowka said that the Government of Saudi Arabia had recently informed the Secretariat that the Houbara Bustard draft agreement had been distributed to the Range States. On the Central Asian Flyway, the Secretariat was working with the Indian Government to prepare a meeting in June 2005 that it was hoped would recommend endorse an action plan for the Flyway and recommend a legal and institutional framework to support its action plan. Work had started on an instrument for the conservation of the Mountain Gorilla: a consultant would be hired, with financial assistance from the United Kingdom, to draw up an action plan; the Secretariat was looking closely at the possibility of developing a binding agreement between the range states. There was good news too on the West African Elephant: the final proposed version of the MoU had been submitted for final comments and it would probably be ready for signature at COP8. On the Saiga Antelope, the competent national authorities had signalled their approval of the draft text of the MoU, but the Secretariat was still waiting to hear which Range States were willing to sign.

17. Mr Marco Barbieri (Scientific and Technical Support Officer) said that his main responsibilities within the Secretariat were to supervise the Small Grants Programme and to support the work of the CMS Scientific Council. Since the 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee progress had been made on developing a CMS instrument for the conservation of small cetaceans and sirenians in Central and West Africa. CMS had endeavoured to identify synergies with a number of other initiatives in the region concerned with the same species and to develop collaborative arrangements. Negotiations with UNEP, the Secretariat of the Abidjan Convention, WWF-West Africa Marine Ecoregion (WAMER) and Wetlands International were well advanced on a joint conservation strategy for the West African Manatee. A joint initiative on small cetacean conservation in West Africa was being discussed with the WWF office in Bremen, Germany, and CMS was poised to start work on an action plan.

18. The Convention had for several years been developing capacities and building up knowledge of the status of, and threats to small cetaceans and dugongs in South-East Asia. A workshop to review the status of the species had been held at the Second International Conference on Marine Mammals of South-East Asia, in 2002 in the Philippines, which CMS had helped to sponsor. A draft action plan and draft agreement had resulted. The proceedings of that conference would shortly be finalized and printed. It was planned to use distribution of the publication to determine the degree of interest among range states and other actors in the region. In the development of a CMS instrument for the conservation of small cetaceans and dugongs in South-East Asia, in accordance with CMS Res. 7.7.

19. The Secretariat had been requested to monitor an NGO initiative on the conservation of small cetaceans in South Asia. Field work in a project in the Bay of Bengal involving four countries (India, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Myanmar) was in the final stages. The findings would be summarized and a workshop organized in late 2005 or early 2006 for those involved as well as a wider audience.

20. Document CMS/StC28/13 provided a summary of recent developments under the Small Grants Programme. Since the last COP, CMS had initiated 17 new projects with support from the CMS Trust Fund to the tune of about \$465,000. The projects had been selected and recommended for funding by the Scientific Council. Since the 27<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee three new projects had been launched: the international action plan for the White-Headed Duck; the international action plan for the Corncrake; and a project on the migration of the Atlantic Leatherback Turtle, in collaboration with WWF and others. It was possible that six further projects could be taken on in 2005, depending on the availability of funding. The Programme was now operated on the principle that the CMS contribution should not exceed 50 per cent of the cost of a project. The conservation projects recommended by the Scientific Council and endorsed by the Standing Committee were fully integrated in the current fundraising efforts.

21. In conclusion Mr Barbieri reported that CMS was involved in preparations for the second Mediterranean Conference on Marine Turtles to be held in Turkey in May 2005 and that CMS had taken part in the International Conference on Biodiversity: Science and Governance in January 2005 and was fully involved in the follow-up.

22. Mr Francisco Rilla (Information and Capacity-Building Officer) gave an overview of the principal functions of the information and capacity building unit. Capacity building was concerned with making CMS an effective instrument for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species; with the training of specialists in the management and study of migratory species and their habitats, to raise public awareness of conservation-related issues; and with improving the dissemination of information about CMS to Parties and non-parties alike, in order to promote conservation at the regional and local level, protect habitats and migration routes, provide the information required in the lead-up to Agreements, and seek synergies with other conventions. Given that Latin America and the Caribbean currently had fewer Parties than any other region, it was particularly important to publicize CMS there and assist non-party states.

23. Support to Parties he regarded as one of his primary functions. It took the form of assistance with monitoring and evaluation (national reports, project evaluation) and assistance to national institutions concerned with the conservation of migratory species, among others. Further important areas of the work included initiating joint work programmes with other conventions, the continuing work on the Global Register of Migratory Species (GROMS), the electronic archive and the promotion of communication with focal points. The seeming overlaps in the organigram between the functions of the different units of the Secretariat did not pose a problem in practice in view of a strong tendency to team work.

24. Ms Paola Deda (Inter-Agency Liaison Officer) reported on new developments in the field of outreach, mentioning in particular the new thesis award in association with Museum Koenig, Bonn; media activities and events, for example in cooperation with Deutsche Welle; the new, improved website and new electronic newsletter in three languages; the recent launch of the CMS exhibition in French; a number of publications and technical series; different types of presentation, for example to university students and other relevant fora; work on posters, for example a poster on marine turtles in preparation for the Year of the Turtle in 2006; and the CMS calendar.

25. In the future, outreach material was to be better targeted on specific audiences including the media, CMS Parties, non-parties, the private sector, other organizations and young audience. An outreach and communication strategy was under preparation and would be submitted to COP8. She indicated that suggestions for the strategy from Members of the Committee would be welcome. CMS would collaborate closely with other United Nations communication offices, in particular UNEP, and consider the establishment of partnerships.

26. Turning to fundraising, she recalled that in response to a request by the Standing Committee for immediate Secretariat action to seek voluntary funding in a more systematic way, a professional fundraiser, Mr Helge Weinberg, had been appointed in 2005 to design and implement a fundraising strategy for CMS. The Committee would hear a progress report by Mr Weinberg under the pertinent agenda item. She also stressed that it was essential to ensure that outreach activities were aligned with the fundraising efforts.

27. The purpose of inter-agency work and partnerships was to liaise with other organizations in order to participate - and make CMS's voice heard - in relevant fora on biodiversity and sustainable development. That could be achieved through joint work programmes and MoUs, intensified cooperation on a daily basis, participation in the Biodiversity Liaison Group, and work harmonization projects. CMS also intended to contribute to achieving the 2010 Target through participation in the Global Partnership on Biodiversity and The IUCN Countdown 2010 Initiative.

28. Mr Hepworth added that, though originally a European initiative, Countdown 2010 was now poised for global expansion. It could potentially become a banner for all MEA activities towards the 2010 Target and a vehicle for recruiting other partners and encouraging the private sector to contribute, not least by 'greening' its activities.

29. Turning to the status of the Convention, Mr Hepworth said that three new Parties, Djibouti, Liberia and Eritrea, had joined since the last meeting of the Standing Committee. Once Rwanda had deposited its instruments of accession the number of CMS Parties to the Convention would reach 90. Seychelles had completed its accession procedures and was expected to become a party before COP8, and Austria was close to doing so. Madagascar was already well advanced in its accession procedures. Iran was keen to join and China was known to be sympathetic. Sierra Leone, Yemen, Cuba and Costa Rica had shown considerable interest. It was hoped that the Russian Federation could be persuaded of the advantages of joining. He appealed to Committee members to assist in encouraging further countries to join.

30. He thanked Parties and other donors that had made voluntary contributions to CMS projects (listed in annex II of document CMS/StC28/5). The list did not include the most recent contributions or co-funding in kind - some of which had been very substantial - for example from France, Belgium and the United Kingdom. Letters had been sent to all Contracting Parties in March 2005 informing them of the next COP, giving details of relevant projects in their region and possible opportunities to donate, setting out for each party its recent record of financial contributions and reminding Parties with unpaid pledges to make payment, especially in view of CMS's difficult financial situation. Mr. Hepworth also stressed that CMS had made a substantial input to the Third IUCN World Conservation Congress, including a workshop on CMS activities headed Migratory Species as a Passport to 2010. He concluded by remarking that the contentedness of Parties was the best advertisement for the Convention when it came to persuading other countries to join.

31. The Chair congratulated the Executive Secretary on having built up a full complement of staff and a strong team. The stronger family spirit within CMS was to be welcomed and encouraged. The expanded team in the mother Secretariat reflected the growing demands placed on it by the Parties and by the increase in the number of Parties. He invited comments from the floor.

32. Mr Galbraith (Chairman of the Scientific Council) said that the relatively small amounts of money allocated under the Small Grants Programme brought relatively large benefits: the projects were effective in terms of public relations and encouraged others to follow on from the CMS contributions. The liaison work with other conventions was encouraging, but it should be extended to the scientific level too. That was something the Scientific Council should consider at its next meeting.

33. In reply to an enquiry by Ms Carrington (Representative of Oceania), Mr Glowka replied that a number of activities had been initiated towards implementation COP Recommendation 7.5 relating to an MoU for Dugong conservation. Australia had offered to take the lead on coordination, and preparations for a workshop in 2005 were under way. With regard to the proposed MoU on South Pacific Cetaceans, he reported that a drafting group formed as an outcome of a meeting in Samoa had prepared a draft MoU which the Secretariat was currently studying in anticipation of a possible further meeting of the drafting group in a few weeks time to consider some further outstanding substantive issues. Good progress was being made. CMS had sponsored an informal dialogue on the whale shark at the third IUCN World Conservation Congress in 2004. The workshop had explored its conservation status and threats, as well as the possibilities for future cooperative action including an MoU or a broader partnership arrangement throughout its range or in a sub-set of its range. The Philippines had expressed interest in leading the development of an MoU. The Secretariat had planned, through the Scientific Council, to hold a workshop in India on one of the greatest threats to whale sharks, fishing, but for a variety of reasons the workshop had not taken place. Given the threats to whale sharks, some sort of cooperative action was necessary. The Seychelles had also expressed interest and was in the process of joining CMS. An international conference on Advancing International Cooperation in Whale Shark Conservation, Science and Management in May 2005 in Western Australia, at which CMS would be represented, would offer an opportunity to discuss further arrangements.

34. Mr van Klaveren (Monaco/ACCOBAMS, observer), stressing the importance of wider CMS coverage, said Monaco would do what it could to encourage non-party countries to join. CMS should play a full part in the current debate on the protection of marine biodiversity, especially in relation to the Berlin Initiative of the International Whaling Commission. Mr Galbraith replied that the Secretariat was aware that with the formation of its Conservation Committee the IWC had become an important partner for CMS, indeed the Secretariat would be represented at the forthcoming IWC meeting.

35. Mr El Kabiri reported that the African Marine Turtles MoU was not functioning as well as the Indian Ocean-Southeast Asia Marine Turtles (IOSEA) MoU. The Secretariat is in process of exploring possibilities of establishing a coordination unit to improve its implementation.

## **Agenda Item 6: Reports from Standing Committee members and observers (including Chair of Scientific Council)**

### **Agenda Item 6(a): Reports from Members and Observers**

36. Mr Williams (Representative of Western Europe) reported on CMS-related activities in Western Europe. The United Kingdom had commissioned consultants to examine the merits of a new agreement in the AEW region for the conservation of migratory raptors. Initial findings from a desk study had suggested that about 30 raptors would benefit from international cooperation. The consultants were endeavouring to determine whether on the basis of the initial findings stakeholders considered that international cooperation would actually bring conservation benefits. The findings of the study would be presented at the next COP. Under a 10-year reintroduction programme for great bustards in the United Kingdom, 22 birds had been released into the wild. Following a few teething problems, including some fatalities, the mood was one of optimism. He thanked all the participants of the Strategic Plan workshop hosted by the United Kingdom in March 2005 for helping to make it a success.

37. Mr Domashlinets (Representative of Central and Eastern Europe) reported on CMS-related activities in Central and Eastern Europe. An agreement on the management of North Western Black Sea populations of sturgeon drawn up in 2003 by the CITES Secretariat had been signed in 2004 by all but one of the relevant range states and he suggested that CMS should become involved. Much attention had been paid to cetacean conservation in the Black Sea region. In 2004 a Georgian/Ukrainian/Russian team had conducted a survey of dolphins in the coastal waters of Georgia. The Black Sea Commission in Istanbul had served as a subregional coordination centre for activities within the framework of ACCOBAMS in the Black Sea region. The draft preparatory conservation plan for cetaceans in the Black Sea had been compiled and presented during the first joint meeting of the advisory group on the conservation of biological diversity and the advisory group on the environmental aspects of management of fisheries and other living marine resources, which had recently been held in Istanbul. In Ukraine, the project on conservational biodiversity in the Azov-Black Sea Ecological Corridor was in progress. A great deal of work had been done during 2004 on the study and conservation of migratory birds along the Black Sea coast and a number of reports produced. In accordance with a request by the Standing Committee, CMS focal points for Central and Eastern Europe countries had been asked to comment on the issue of delegate funding for attendance at CMS COP. The only replies that had been received so far were from Hungary and the Czech Republic, which had requested continued support.

38. On the question of how best to encourage the Russian Federation to join the CMS and its daughter Agreements, it was agreed that a letter co-signed by the Chair and Executive Secretary, acting on behalf of the Standing Committee, would be sent to the Government of the Russian Federation encouraging it to review its position on CMS accession, with a copy sent simultaneously for information to the depositary state; Germany would then raise the matter at a forthcoming high-level bilateral meeting on the environment and nature conservation. It was recommended that in general Members and the Secretariat should make use of bilateral contacts with donors and potential donors to learn more about their bilateral funding mechanisms and how to activate them.

39. Ms Wilson (Representative of Asia) reported on some of the main developments and activities carried out in Sri Lanka for the conservation of migrant birds. The Department of Wildlife Conservation (DWLC) had organized a national bird ringing programme every year and updated bird records by direct observations. It also conducted public awareness programmes in bird conservation. Five species of Marine Turtles, all of them endangered and threatened, regularly visited Sri Lanka's beaches. All sea turtles and their products were fully protected under the Fauna and Flora Protection Ordinance and violations incurred stiff penalties. The tsunami of 26 December 2004 had destroyed almost all the turtle nests along the southern beach, nevertheless

the DWLC had started patrolling again only two days later. There had been less damage to biodiversity than to people and property, thanks to the natural ecosystems along the coast line.

40. On behalf of the Standing Committee, the Chair expressed his sympathy to the people of Sri Lanka, the Asian region and the eastern seaboard of Africa who had been directly affected by the tsunami, praising the magnificent spirit they had displayed in rebuilding their lives and livelihoods. It was interesting to note that areas with intact biodiversity had demonstrated an ability to recover from such a disaster.

41. Mr Haffane (Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee; Representative of North Africa) said that other countries in the region had been asked to submit reports of their activities, but none had been received. That was not to say that nothing was happening in those countries. As far as his own country, Morocco, was concerned, a number of activities of a regional nature had been undertaken *inter alia* in connection with the Sahelo-Sahara Antelope Project and the plan of action to conserve the monk seal in the eastern Atlantic, which had been adopted at a meeting in Dakhla in October 2004 and would be presented at COP8. At the national level, he outlined a number of legislative and institutional measures taken by Morocco towards implementing the Convention, including a draft bill on conservation areas using a new procedure based on IUCN categories; a draft bill on trade in wild species of fauna and flora in response to recommendations by CITES; and, for habitat conservation, implementation of national parks development plans, studies preparatory to drawing up development and management plans for eight sites of biological and ecological interest, and strengthening the monitoring programme and the infrastructure of the national Sahelo-Sahara antelope reserves.

42. Mr van Klaveren hoped that the initiative to conserve the monk seal in the eastern Atlantic would give new impetus to flagging efforts in the Mediterranean region and that the two initiatives would work together. Mr El Kabiri reported that coordination was moving ahead satisfactorily, for example there had been contact between CMS and the Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA) of the Mediterranean Action Plan and the Bern Convention in that regard. The Dakhla meeting had provided additional impetus.

43. Mr Koyo (Representative of Southern Africa) said that the African states had continued to fulfil their commitments under the Convention through activities aimed at conserving migratory species at local, national and regional level. On the African Elephant, he said that range states in southern, western, central and eastern Africa had continued implementation of a long-term monitoring programme in the context of the CITES MIKE programme. The region welcomed the proposed MoU on the West African Elephant as a means of further enhancing involvement and refocusing attention on the plight of the elephants in the region. Turning to the Mountain Gorilla, he said that the strategy of the International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) continued to focus on two key conservation targets within the Albertine Rift: mountain gorilla populations and the regional Afromontane forest habitats. The strategy of the programme was based on identifying threats to those targets and implementing specific strategies for their abatement. During the reporting period occasional poaching of mountain gorilla had taken place, ecosystem and population monitoring had remained a high priority and a gorilla census had been conducted throughout the region; attempts had been made to reintroduce infant mountain gorillas confiscated in 2002.

44. Turning to marine and coastal species, he said that general threats to marine turtles, whales and sharks included negative impacts of land-based developments. A number of countries in eastern Africa had initiated turtle conservation programmes and signed the IOSEA MoU. Work had been going on under specific action plans to conserve a number of migratory bird species including the great snipe, the black-crowned crane, the black stork and the black-winged pratincole. No detailed action to introduce and re-establish water bird species had been carried out in Africa during the period from 2002-2005. On habitat conservation, work on inventories of wetlands used as staging sites for water birds continued in Africa, and the development and implementation of

management plans for key wetlands in Africa had also been undertaken since 2002. Inventories were still needed in the Horn of Africa, particularly in Djibouti, Eritrea and the Somalia coast, southern Sudan and some sections of the western Sahelian flood plains. Development and implementation of management plans for key wetlands in Africa had been undertaken since 2002. Under the auspices of Wetland Biodiversity Monitoring Scheme (WBMS) for eastern Africa, management plans had been developed for two sites, in Sudan and Ethiopia. Wetland habitat degradation, unsustainable use of wetlands and pollution were the major challenges. As for research and monitoring, bi-annual water bird census programmes were continuing in most countries, and satellite tracking of the lesser flamingo had been initiated to assess movement patterns in eastern Africa. A number of national and local organizations were involved in migratory water bird conservation and management programmes in Africa, including WWF, IUCN, BirdLife International, Wetlands International, Ramsar Convention, AWEA Secretariat, CBD and UNEP.

45. It was considered that since the African continent drew together many of the issues likely to constitute the key challenges for CMS in the next triennium, they should be brought to the attention of the next COP, possibly in the form of a plenary presentation, especially as the venue was likely to be in Africa. Mr Hepworth emphasized the need to step up efforts to persuade non-party states in southern Africa to join CMS, in order to fill the current 'SADC gap'.

46. Ms Carrington said that the activities of the Oceania region during the reporting period were set out in a written report which had been approved by all the regional members and circulated to Members of the Committee. She drew particular attention to the Agreement on Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), for which Australia had provided a permanent Secretariat in Hobart. The first meeting of the parties had been held in November 2004. Work on a draft text for a migratory water birds partnership and action plan for the East Asian-Australasian Flyway under the World Summit on Sustainable Development would be finalized in late 2005.

47. In the absence of a representative of the Americas and the Caribbean, Mr Rilla briefly outlined from memory some of the principal activities and developments of the region. There were currently nine CMS Parties in the region and it was hoped that a further four countries (Cuba, Costa Rica, Brazil and Venezuela) would join in the foreseeable future. He singled out for particular mention a project to draw up national plans to conserve the High Andean Flamingo, involving Peru, Ecuador, Argentina and Chile, and a project for the conservation of small procellariiformes. Brazil's involvement in the African Atlantic Coast Marine Turtles MoU could possibly help to persuade that country of the advantages of becoming a party to the Convention. Great concern was felt about the impact of forestry on ecosystems in the Cono Sur which, among other things, had caused a dramatic decline in Black-Necked Swan populations. CMS should perhaps intervene with the aim of helping to identify appropriate forms of sustainable forest use in the areas concerned.

48. Mr van Klaveren observed that the responsibility for damage to ecosystems inflicted by commercial and industrial activities could often be traced back to countries other than those affected. He wondered whether CMS might be able to serve as a forum of exchange between affected countries and countries able to exert influence on the companies or industries responsible, for example he had in mind some sort of procedure that would enable, say, the Chair of the Standing Committee to draw a country's attention to the damaging activities of one of its companies. Mr Hepworth, agreeing in principle with the point made, said the Secretariat would like to reflect on what the most appropriate course of action might be.

49. Mr Streit (EUROBATS) drew the Committee's attention to a written report on EUROBATS activities, to which he had nothing to add except to endorse the sentiments expressed earlier about the new family spirit in CMS since the advent of the new management.

50. Mr Schwenzfeier (Representative of the Depositary) reported that in the latest of a series of campaigns by the Depositary to encourage new parties to join the Convention, 32 countries had been approached directly through the respective German embassies, and the attention of a further 20 countries been drawn to CMS and to the subject of migratory species. Although it was impossible to determine the specific outcome of that campaign, he hoped it had borne some fruit, perhaps even contributing to the accession of the four new contracting Parties. The campaigns would continue in the future.

51. A discussion ensued on how best to recruit new parties in order to enlarge and strengthen CMS. It was considered that bilateral contacts between party states and non-party states could well be used to encourage countries to accede. A number of members expressed the view that in general efforts should be more systematic and better co-ordinated. It was suggested that the Secretariat should prepare a general 'recruitment concept'. Mr Hepworth emphasized the need for a flow of information from Parties to the Secretariat on contacts and links, as well as the need to set priorities. The largest gaps on the CMS global membership map were in Latin America, southern Africa and east Asia. The Chair said the matter might usefully be made the subject of a draft resolution at COP8 as a reminder to Parties to communicate effectively and early with the Secretariat. The point was made that a new thematic work programme on island biodiversity was to be the only new area under CBD's work programme until 2010. That fact in itself could be turned to account for CMS purposes and act as a pointer for priority setting. It was further suggested that the "Friends of CMS" initiative could be used for lobbying as well as for fund-raising purposes.

52. Mr van Klaveren drew the Committee's attention to document CMS/StC28/Inf.11.5, which contained information about *inter alia* the status of the Agreement, the Secretariat and its staff, as well as the main activities carried out in 2004. The number of Contracting Parties to the Agreement currently stood at 17, not 18 as stated in the document. That was because Italy had not yet deposited the instrument, though it had completed the ratification process. Updating the information in the document, he reported that France, Greece and Croatia had also completed the accession procedure. The good relations that had grown up between ACCOBAMS and the European Commission should certainly benefit work in the Mediterranean Sea. An exchange of letters had served to strengthen relations with UNEP, as called for by the Meeting of Parties, and to clarify a number of issues: for example, the Agreement could now use the acronym ACCOBAMS/CMS/UNEP; the ACCOBAMS logo could now be used alongside the CMS and UNEP logos; and the flags of UNEP and the United Nations could be used at institutional meetings organized by ACCOBAMS. He thanked the CMS Secretariat for their support in bringing about the exchange of letters.

53. Mr Lenten (AEWA) said that a number of events had been planned to mark the tenth anniversary in 2005 of the conclusion of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Water Birds (AEWA) in The Hague, Netherlands, including Migratory Water Bird Day on 9-10 April 2005, which had been celebrated in 22 countries, and an exhibition in Museum Koenig, Bonn. The next Meeting of the Parties would take place in October 2005 in Dakar, Senegal, during which an AEWA award would be made to one institution and one individual. Under the outreach programme, AEWA endeavoured to publish one article every month in a newspaper in the region. He thanked the Government of Germany for the support it had provided to the Secretariat including a shortly to be appointed junior professional officer. He thanked the governments of Switzerland and the United Kingdom for their support. Of the 30 range states of the Central Asian Flyway action plan, 16 were in the AEWA region, in terms not only of geographical scope but of species as well, since 50 per cent of the populations were covered by the AEWA action plan. There was therefore considerable overlap. AEWA was following developments closely and hoped a solution could be found.

54. Mr Hepworth introduced the reports submitted by three secretariats that had been unable to send a representative to the meeting of the Standing Committee. He began with the report of the Interim Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) contained in document CMS/StC28/Inf.4. The Agreement had only been in force for a little over a year and had already made a name for itself. Six Parties had ratified the Agreement and a further five countries had signed but not yet ratified. The first meeting of the Advisory Committee would take place in Hobart in July 2005. He thanked the government of Australia for hosting the Interim Secretariat in Hobart until such time as the Headquarters Agreement with the Australian Government had been secured.

55. As a general principle, Mr. Hepworth stressed the importance of regional agreements being rooted in the regions they served, whether through a country secretariat, an outpost secretariat within UNEP, or through an NGO partner.

56. The report of the Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS) was contained in document CMS/StC28/Inf.11.2. That Agreement currently had eight parties, and the accession of two further Baltic Range States and France was expected before the Meeting of the Parties in 2006. Mr Hepworth said he had been impressed at ASCOBANS meetings by the dedication of the people working under the Agreement. Clearly, the focus on a relatively small group of species in a single geographical area facilitated progress. The Agreement was now faced with the challenge of expanding the Agreement area. Action was also needed to achieve closer forms of cooperation between ASCOBANS and ACCOBAMS, so that the two Agreements were as co-ordinated and harmonized as possible, not just in terms of geography, but ideally in terms of species as well. The countries on the borders of the two Agreement areas, Portugal and Spain, had not found it easy to embrace both Agreements as they stood.

57. Turning to the report of the Secretariat of the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia (IOSEA) contained in CMS/StC28/Inf.11.1, he said the MoU was bubbling with action. Its model of meeting once a year rather than setting up committee structures seemed to be working well in its circumstances. Indonesia had recently joined the MoU, which could be a signal that it was willing to accede to CMS as well. The online reporting facility under IOSEA was a huge advance in the way information from signatory States was gathered, consolidated and analysed. That information was being shared with CMS and the other CMS secretariats and it was felt that the system could be extended. The future of reporting might well be a continuous process carried out online in an agreed format, rather than a written exercise performed at intervals of several years, enabling reports on different aspects of implementation to be produced very rapidly. He drew particular attention to the Year of the Turtle Campaign, which would be in 2006.

58. UNEP's report to the Committee was contained in document CMS/StC28/Inf.6.1. The issue-based modular approach to the implementation of MEA decisions at national level was an important project in which all the biodiversity conventions would be invited to take part. The pilot countries, several of which would be in Africa, were still being selected. The regional implementation workshops, in which CMS had participated, were an extremely cost-effective way for CMS of endeavouring to recruit new parties and assisting existing Parties to implement the Convention more effectively, as UNEP helped to cover CMS's costs. Regarding the RMount gorilla, Mr Hepworth said that while there were many action programmes and a good framework of cooperation on the ground Great Apes Survival Project (GRASP), an agreement offering long-term security was missing, and that was something CMS could provide. It was hoped to start the process during 2005; how rapid progress would be would depend not least on the political climate and the continuation of the peace initiatives in the Democratic Republic of Congo. The UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) was continuing to work with CMS on a number of projects including the consolidation of the CMS national reports. Lastly, he commended the report on the progress and activities in 2004 of the UNEP-GEF Siberian Crane Project contained in the annex of the report.

59. In reply to an enquiry by Mr Koyo about the CMS strategy on MoU development, Mr Hepworth said CMS took its cue from the requests of contracting Parties, with inputs from the Conference of the Parties, the Scientific Council and the Standing Committee itself. It had to be borne in mind that MoUs were regional agreements between sovereign governments and that the governments themselves had to take the initiative. The CMS could not be too proactive. It was however sometimes necessary to grasp opportunities as they arose. Priorities clearly had to be set according to the urgency of the conservation needs of a particular species.

60. Mr O'Sullivan (BirdLife International) said that BirdLife International's interest in and commitment to CMS had been clearly demonstrated in the reporting period, *inter alia* by its regular attendance at meetings, its inputs to the ACAP Advisory Committee meeting and to the proposed new raptor agreement. A presentation by BirdLife International to a meeting of the European Science Foundation in February 2005 had given a high-profile to CMS. He drew attention to the Aquatic Warbler Newsletter and Aquatic Warbler Website and described BI's involvement in work to conserve the tiny remaining populations of the bald ibis. Welcoming the 'fresh breeze' blowing through the Secretariat, he paid tribute to the work of its members, both long-standing and incoming. Now that the Secretariat had reached peak strength it would be a pity not to furnish it with the resources it required and he appealed to Members of the Committee to help to find ways of doing so.

61. Ms Prideaux (Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society) said WDCS had welcomed the invitation to attend the Standing Committee meeting for the first time. WDCS believed that CMS and its daughter Agreements would be an important element in worldwide cetacean conservation in the future. WDCS was keen to participate in CMS's work, to develop a deeper relationship with the Secretariat and Convention and to align its own work plan with the CMS Strategic Plan and with the work plans of the Agreements and MoUs. She reported that Small Island Developing States in the South Pacific were enthusiastic about the CMS initiative and the honesty of its approach, stressing the importance for these States of linkages between CMS and CBD.

#### **Agenda Item 6(b): Report of the Scientific Council Chairman**

62. Mr Galbraith (Chair, Scientific Council) said that the previous meeting of the Scientific Council, held in Glasgow in March 2004, had dealt with the Council's strategy for underpinning the work of the Convention and with its *modus operandi* as the Convention grew, on which issue more work was required. The Council's agenda had covered concerted action species, a range of proposals for action on other species, potential new agreements, as well as information sources. He outlined the work undertaken in the intervening period and expressed his support for an agreement on raptor conservation. Looking to the future, he said that the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) had shown that global ecosystems were becoming increasingly homogenized. That meant that species extinctions were likely to be 10,000 times higher than historic rates. Even for a scientist, the implications of the MEA's report were mind-blowing and boded ill for the achievement of the 2010 Target and for future human well-being. The MEA findings were consistent with the status of the 40 or so concerted action species listed in Appendix I of the CMS Convention, of which the majority remained in rapid decline. In the light of the implications of climate change and eutrophication on human populations and systems, the question now was how should CMS respond. The large global community of scientists working on climate change had not yet thought through the implications for migratory species, and they should be encouraged to do so. In his view, CMS should not hesitate to grapple with those larger issues by putting them forward, with recommendations, to the COP and referring them to the next meeting of the Scientific Council. The Strategic Plan was clearly fundamental. It was also important to build on the common ground that existed with other biodiversity conventions and seek closer scientific integration. Clearly neither the Scientific Council nor the Convention could operate to maximum effect without adequate resources, and imagination would be required to raise the necessary funds.

The CMS was better positioned scientifically than it had ever been thanks to the work and commitment of a large number of people inside and outside the Scientific Council.

63. Mr Koyo asked how information was channelled to end-users. Mr Galbraith replied that the main channels were reports, websites, seminars and workshops. He was optimistic that the new outreach capacity would enable the scientific community and practitioners on the ground to be more easily reached, adding that he would welcome any ideas for improvement. It was pointed out that the Internet was of little value in countries where access was limited. Other solutions were required if people were to be persuaded to abandon bad ecological practices. Mr Rilla stressed the need to facilitate the dissemination of information at all levels, adding that the CMS website must be a true vehicle of communication and not an end in itself. Resources should be sought from aid agencies to improve communication in developing countries. It was further pointed out that the purpose of the GROMS review was to determine to what extent the Register was being used and how an imbalance, if such existed, between developed and developing countries could be redressed. Mr Williams reported that the United Kingdom had commissioned a study into the links between climate change and migratory species and that its findings would be made available shortly.

#### **Agenda Item 7: Sahelo-Saharan Antelope Project: Progress**

64. Mr El Kabiri outlined the background and status of the project including recent progress and current constraints. Further details of the project were contained in document CMS/StC28/12. A discussion ensued on the complexity of reintroducing into the wild animals that had become used to being close to humans. The project had sought to address that problem through information activities, associations and partnerships and by negotiating solutions with the local population, civil society and the tourist sector among others. Poaching and illegal killing were a major problem and could prove disastrous once a critical point in the decline of a species had been reached. The problem was also politically sensitive; nevertheless, it was imperative to find ways of putting a stop to poaching and hunting and CMS should send out a robust and scientifically defensible message to that effect. It was suggested that a paper should be prepared in consultation with IUCN for submission to COP8.

65. The question arose of the role played by Algeria, which was not a party to CMS, under the project. It was reported that Algeria had participated in all the project workshops, that it was in the process of joining AEWA and would probably accede to CMS. It was agreed that Algeria should be singled out for specific attention.

66. The Chair said he took it that the Committee wished to take note of the Secretariat's report and to encourage the Secretariat to continue to roll out the agreed project; to attract further parties and funding; to cooperate with IUCN to provide a paper on scientific and illegal killing issues; and to take soundings on the creation of a WSSD partnership for Sahelo-Sahara antelope antelopes. It was so agreed.

#### **Agenda Item 8: Resources**

##### **Agenda Item 8(a): Secretariat Manpower and Organization**

67. (This agenda item was subject to a closed session. This portion of the report is found in Annex 3 and is subject to restricted distribution to Standing Committee members.)

##### **Agenda Item 8(b): Status of CMS Budget 2003-2005**

68. Mr Hepworth said that CMS was facing the double whammy of a substantial devaluation of the dollar against the euro and a reserve depleted by recent drawdowns. Table 1 of document

CMS/StC28/5 showed total income for the current triennium of \$1,849,000 compared with total claims on resources of \$2,084,000. That deficit had been incurred in a year when the equivalent of three professional posts had remained unfilled, not to mention vacancies at the general staff level, so that it might otherwise have been as high \$500,000. The Secretariat had endeavoured in a number of ways to make the best possible use of available funds, but the central problem was the devaluation of the dollar, which was expected to persist in the foreseeable future. The drawdown on reserves could not continue.

69. Ms Kanza said that document CMS/StC28/5 presented the status of the budget in 2004 and a projection to the end of 2005. As the end of the project cycle approached, staff capacity was good, but the resource situation was poor. Available funds were no longer sufficient to cover the work programme approved by COP7 in 2002. The growth in the number of Parties, a full complement of staff and the diminishing purchasing power of the dollar had led to the need to drawdown on reserves. The gap between pledges and paid contributions was increasing, leading to a shortfall in contributions over expenditure. Reminders had been sent to Parties in arrears and it was anticipated that more contributions would be received. She appealed to Parties, non-parties and friends of the Convention alike to make generous contributions towards filling the financial gap, achieving the targets set and ensuring a well attended Conference of the Parties at the end of the year.

70. A brief discussion ensued on the pros and cons of adopting the euro as the Convention's currency, to avoid exchange rate losses. In reply to a query about the wisdom of upsizing the Secretariat at a time of financial austerity, Mr Hepworth said that the vacant posts had been filled not least in response to enormous pressure from Parties and that the delays in recruitment had been due to the onerous requirements of the United Nations recruitment system. As to specific action taken to secure payment of arrears on assessed contributions, he said that, in addition to the standard letter of reminder, the Parties concerned had been approached directly through diplomatic channels. Parties that were more than six years in arrears had also been reminded that they would lose their vote at the next COP. The response so far had been modest, with only one party having announced that it was taking steps to repay.

#### **Agenda Item 8(c): Fundraising project: Interim report**

71. Mr Weinberg, speaking at the invitation of the Chair, introduced a fundraising strategy for the CMS family (CMS/StC28/6). He opened his remarks by noting that the fundraising environment in Germany was not particularly favourable at the current time because tsunami-related donations had swallowed up a large amount of charitable funds and because nature conservation was in strong competition with more popular causes such as health and children. As well as fundraising, the strategy was also concerned with media relations. An open-ended list had been compiled of companies that might be interested in cooperating with CMS. A presentation for donors had been prepared and acquisition letters drafted targeting marketing and environmental managers. A start had been made on contacting companies by mail, phone or personal contact. Several expressions of interest from companies were already being followed up. The first stage in the proposed strategy was to win donors through existing CMS corporate contacts and, in parallel, to build up further partnerships with other companies.

72. The aim of "Friends of CMS" was to create a network of partners. Membership would be offered to, for example, high-ranking executives and outstanding individuals from the realms of science, nature and the media. Based in Bonn, Friends of CMS would initially draw its members from Germany, and later from a wider international arena. Among other things it would handle CMS fundraising activities; organize meetings, workshops, receptions and exhibitions; support CMS projects; take part as an observer in official meetings of CMS; and provide input and advice on matters involving the business community. It would have the option, along the lines of the successful UNICEF model, of nominating ambassadors for CMS as from 2006. Special events for members of Friends of CMS had been planned for August 2005, but its official launch would not take place until COP8.

Initially, Friends of CMS would focus on the corporate sector in order to establish a sound financial basis, before casting its net further afield. He called on Members of the Standing Committee to support the fundraising effort through their contacts worldwide and to give advice on potential members of Friends of CMS or on companies that might be willing to engage in joint projects or donate funds.

73. The feeling of the Standing Committee was that the strategy was a sound, well thought out response to the request made by its 27th Meeting. The Chair drew attention to the need to ensure that the "Friends of CMS" association was concordant with United Nations rules and procedures. Mr van Klaveren was concerned that centralizing fundraising within the CMS family might ultimately reduce the total amount of funds obtained, as well as raising the question of their distribution. Mr Weinberg insisted that the prospects of success were greater if CMS acted as an entity rather than competing within the CMS family, adding that many companies preferred projects, species or even regions, to organizations. Mr Hepworth made the point that although the initial thrust of the fundraising activities would be in Germany, corporate giving was actually better established in, for example, the United Kingdom and the USA. Nevertheless, since there was a great deal of sympathy for the United Nations in Germany and the CMS had been based in that country since its creation, he was confident that scope was there. Ms Deda commented that the creation of Friends of CMS did not imply that the Secretariat intended to abdicate responsibility for fundraising. The RHcreation of Friends of CMS was part of a wider strategy; there would be other partnerships for other types of fundraising. It was suggested that a pilot phase was needed to allow progress to be assessed, possibly at the COP. Thereafter it would be up to the Parties to decide whether or not to continue. One speaker warned CMS not to lose sight of its traditional supporters in its eagerness to tap new sources of funding. It was agreed that a detailed information paper on the fundraising strategy should be prepared for the COP. With the reservations expressed, the Committee took note of the steps taken to develop a targeted, fundraising strategy and agreed in principle to the creation of a "Friends of CMS" body to be launched at the next COP.

#### **Agenda Item 8(d): Report of the Budget Working Group for next triennium (2006-2008)**

74. Mr Williams (Chair of the Budget Working Group) said that document CMS/StC28/7 summarized the work accomplished by the Budget Working Group to date. The primary purpose of the group was to draw up simplified, indicative budgets for a number of scenarios, to provide Parties with information in advance of the COP and alert them to the consequences for CMS activities of each scenario. The indicative budgets for four scenarios (shown in Annex A of the document) were all based on the assumption that there would be no reserves on which to call. The first budget, based on zero growth of party subscriptions compared to the current triennium, was insufficient to cover even the staff costs for the next triennium. The second budget, based on zero growth in expenditure compared to the current triennium, would cover staff costs and make a contribution towards the costs of the COP in 2008, but would be unable to fund activities. The third, "no-change" scenario allowed the programme output of the current triennium to be maintained, although this constituted a 34% increase in expenditure in US\$ (the % figure expressed in € was under 1%). The fourth scenario allowed for an increase in outputs compared with the current triennium and represented a 19 per cent increase over the current budget in € (60% in US\$).

75. Annexes 1B and 1C set out the calculations and assumptions underlying the scenarios, whilst Annex 2A showed the related subscription levels. The Standing Committee was invited to express a view on whether the four scenarios should be presented to the COP in the simplified format, and suggested that it would be useful to indicate which expenditure was discretionary and which not. Recognizing that the fall in the dollar against the euro had led to a decline in dollar purchasing power and that, to compensate, the Secretariat had to make more drawdowns against its reserves, the working group had reached the view that the COP should be invited at least to consider receiving subscriptions in euros rather than dollars, in order to counter the adverse effects of the dollar euro exchange rate. Interestingly, using euro instead of dollar figures actually reduced the increase over the previous budget to less than one per cent.

76. The working group had also briefly considered options for generating income and reducing costs in the next triennium. Most of the options, including reducing the size of the Secretariat and relocating the Secretariat outside the euro zone, had been set out in a paper circulated to Members of the Standing Committee. The working group would explore those options further if the Standing Committee so wished.

77. Mr Galbraith said the Committee should not overlook the value of the project fund. As far as the presentation of the budget was concerned, he made the point that administrators easily became worried by percentages, whereas the absolute amounts concerned were in many cases relatively trivial.

78. (The remainder of the discussion on this agenda item was held in closed session. This portion of the report is found in Annex 4 and is subject to restricted distribution to Standing Committee members.)

### **Agenda Item 9: Planning**

#### **Agenda Item 9(a): Strategic Plan**

79. Mr Hepworth explained that work on the review of progress under the current strategic plan was being conducted internally by the Secretariat and that a paper would be produced for the next COP. Noting that national reports were vital to the process of reviewing progress, he said that WCMC had collaborated closely with the Secretariat on a revised, harmonized, semi-computerized format that would make it much easier to produce a synoptic report for the COP. The question still outstanding was how to compile a full report on the review of the Strategic Plan, taking that information into account. The original idea of having the work carried out externally had been dropped when it became clear that the priority for all the Parties involved and for the Secretariat was to obtain a better future strategic plan, to which the financial and intellectual resources of the Secretariat had then been devoted. He hoped that the draft of the Secretariat's report which would be produced in-house could be reviewed by the strategic plan working group before being finalized and submitted to the COP through the Standing Committee. The Chair thanked Mr Hepworth for his report and his proposal was agreed.

#### **Agenda Item 9(b): Report of the Working Group**

80. Mr Biber (Switzerland, Chairman of the Open-Ended Strategic Plan Working Group), introducing the item, reported that a workshop hosted by the United Kingdom had taken place in March 2005 for the purpose of producing a revised draft Strategic Plan, in accordance with the request made by the Standing Committee at its 27th Meeting. The revised draft Plan, a note of the Strategic Planning Meeting and a note by the Secretariat were contained in document CMS/StC28/8. Mr Christoph Imboden had been workshop facilitator.

81. Mr Imboden (consultant) gave a comprehensive presentation of the Strategic Plan. He began by outlining some of the general principles of the logical framework approach to planning, explaining the pyramid structure of vision, goals, objectives and targets, and emphasizing the importance of monitoring and evaluation. He went on to show how that framework had been applied to the specific context of CMS in order to produce the new draft Plan. In particular he commented on the importance of an implementation plan. The Committee thanked Mr Imboden for his work on the revised draft and congratulated him on his presentation.

82. The Chair emphasized that the Strategic Plan had remained broadly unchanged; it had merely been set in a format that was easier to interrogate. As far as the budget was concerned, a

dual presentation seemed to lend itself: on the one hand in the standard United Nations format, which was in any case mandatory, and on the other, in a more realistic format, linking desired outcomes to their funding requirements. The Standing Committee was invited to comment on the revised draft, in particular to consider whether the logical framework presented was satisfactory and whether the 2010 Target had been adequately integrated; to provide further guidance to the Chairman of the Working Group and Secretariat, as necessary; and to approve procedures for the submission of the revised Strategic Plan to COP8.

83. Mr Lenten was uncertain about whether the Strategic Plan applied only to the Convention or to the whole CMS family. In the opinion of Mr van Klaveren CMS should urge the Parties to the daughter Agreements to participate in the implementation of the CMS's global strategy. The Chair tended to the view that the Strategic Plan was primarily for CMS, and CMS should not attempt to impose it on the Agreements, which had distinct constituencies of their own, though clearly the CMS Plan could be used by others as a tool in devising their own plans. Mr Hepworth agreed, pointing out that the so-called 'Article IV Agreements' had a legal basis of their own. Nevertheless, Article VII of the Convention should be borne in mind and provided that it was incumbent on the parent Convention to monitor progress under all the Agreements. Mr Imboden said it was not difficult to link the strategic plan of a parent body with the plans of subordinate bodies in a system of cascading logical frameworks. Recalling that many Agreement secretariats had been consulted from the beginning, Mr Biber asked whether those secretariats would have the opportunity to submit the CMS Strategic Plan to their own standing committees or other relevant bodies before COP8; that way they could ascertain whether the Plan was universally acceptable within the CMS family. The Chair replied that whilst it was a valid aspiration for the Agreements to align their own plans with the CMS Strategic Plan, which was in any case in the public domain, it was up to the Meetings of the Parties of the Agreements, not the CMS Standing Committee, to decide whether or not they should do so.

84. The view was expressed that the role of the Contracting Parties in the implementation of the Strategic Plan had not been sufficiently emphasized in the document. Mr Imboden stressed that the Strategic Plan was for the whole of CMS, not just for the Secretariat. Without the contributions of the Contracting Parties, the targets could not be achieved. But he agreed that their role could perhaps be made clearer in the Plan, adding that an implementation table setting out the tasks to be performed by the Parties had also been prepared, but was still in draft form and had therefore not been circulated. Mr Schwenzfeier said it was imperative not to prevent a possible misunderstanding from arising, namely that the activities deriving from the Strategic Plan were the responsibility of the Secretariat alone and would consequently be financed from its budget. It must be made absolutely clear that the responsibility for their implementation lay primarily with the Parties. The Chair said he concluded from the discussion so far that the Committee wished to ask the working group to clarify further in the text the primary role of the Contracting Parties in delivery of the Plan and the Secretariat's role as facilitator. Mr Hepworth suggested it should also look again at the relationship between the Article IV Agreements and the Plan. Asked whether, as chairman of the working group, he was ready to continue the process of finalizing a version of the Plan to submit to the COP, Mr Biber replied that he was. He requested clarification on a number of points however: Should the working group confine itself to the Strategic Plan or address details of implementation as well? Should the implementation table be part of the documents submitted to the COP, and should it set out the responsibilities of the various bodies under the Convention? Would the services of the facilitator continue to be available to the working group? If not, what assistance could the working group expect from the Secretariat? The Chair observed that since the implementation table had not been circulated it was difficult for the Committee to consider whether it should form part of the document, however he saw no reason why it should not be attached as an information document to the main document in an annex.

85. Mr Koyo wanted to see a clear link made in the document between the world heritage aspects of the conservation of migratory species and the sustainable livelihoods of local communities. There was general support for this from the regional representatives. The Chairman of the Working Group emphasized that CMS was essentially a wildlife conservation convention and expressed preference to

see poverty alleviation, and related issues covered in the text rather than the main goals of CMS. In the end, the Committee agreed to amend Goal 2 to “to ensure the favourable conservation status of migratory species, thereby contributing to sustainable livelihoods”.

86. Mr Hepworth added that the Secretariat was considering whether it should prepare a proposal for the COP on the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (CBD Guidelines), as the globally agreed framework on those issues, pointing out that the Guidelines had already been endorsed by CITES and the Ramsar Convention. It was felt that a more economical way of making the link to the CBD Guidelines would be through a reference in the Strategic Plan. Ms Wilson suggested inclusion of a reference to traditional knowledge in the Plan.

87. On the further procedure, it was agreed that the Secretariat would collect the proposed textual amendments and other changes discussed and pass them to the working group. The working group would, by means of electronic communication, confirm a final draft for presentation to the COP. In parallel, the Secretariat in collaboration with both the Strategic Plan Working Group and the Budget Working Group, would start work on aligning the budget with the Strategic Plan.

#### **Agenda Item 9(c) CMS and the 2010 Biodiversity Target**

88. Mr. Barbieri presented a report of the Secretariat (document CMS/StC28/9) on the progress of CMS activities in relation to the 2010 Target. He recalled that at its 12th meeting the Scientific Council had recommended that CMS’s achievement of the 2010 Target should figure more prominently in the draft CMS Strategic Plan and that the CMS Secretariat should liaise with the CBD Secretariat to determine what would be the most appropriate inputs for CMS. WWF had proposed that CMS consider the development of a sub-index for migratory species within the Living Planet Index (LPI). The CMS Secretariat had responded positively to that proposal in informal discussions and meetings with WWF and the Committee was now invited to endorse that response on the understanding that any such work would be jointly funded by CMS and WWF. Mr Imboden emphasized the importance of having an index component for migratory species. He reported that the Species Survival Commission (SSC), the source of the LPI’s information, was in the process of expanding its Red List Index (RLI) to create a more general assessment index. CMS should certainly make a contribution to that work; it should not just concentrate on red list species.

89. Notwithstanding the recent proliferation of indicators, Mr Galbraith felt that CMS should develop its own, possibly using an ecosystem approach based on Appendix I and Appendix II species while at the same time having regard to what CMS could contribute to other initiatives. It was agreed that the matter should be referred to the Scientific Council for further review. It was further agreed that the Biodiversity Liaison Group should be asked to consider at its next meeting on 10 May 2005 not only the development, but also the application of indicators, including possible amendment of the GROMS database for that purpose. Given the complexity of indicator development, the Secretariat was requested to organize a side-event at COP8 to inform Contracting Parties and other collaborating institutions about CMS’s work in the field. It was considered desirable that indicators should ultimately be standardized across the various biodiversity conventions.

90. The Committee was asked to request the Secretariat to follow the development of the Living Planet Index (LPI) and the Red List Index (RLI); to request the Scientific Council to consider, at its next meeting, the significance of the indicators for migratory species in the light of the Convention’s objectives and targets and the 2010 Target, as well as the requirement for their effective application, with a view to providing advice to the COP on further action; to request the Secretariat to continue following the work on indicators within the Ramsar Convention, with a view to developing synergies where appropriate; and to request the Council to consider options for further developing a report covering the 42 CMS concerted action species, with a view to assisting progress in achieving the Convention’s objectives, in conjunction with possible indicators. It was so agreed.

#### **Agenda Item 9(d): Report on CMS projects**

91. Mr. Barbieri recalled that the Committee had heard a general account of the CMS Small Grant Programme (first section of Secretariat's report in document CMS/StC28/13) under Agenda Item 5. In the past the Programme had been funded through withdrawals from the Trust Fund, duly authorized by the COP, based on savings made in previous exercises, but, with dwindling reserves, that option was unlikely to be available in the next triennium at least. Moreover, depending on the budget scenario chosen by the COP for the next triennium, few funds, if any, were likely to be available under the core budget to support the Programme; therefore, if the Programme was to be continued, it would have to be on the basis of voluntary funding. It might then be necessary to consider a revision of the current mechanism for the identification of projects, for example moving towards conceptual - rather than fully developed - proposals that were clearly linked to the Strategic Plan, perhaps tailored to a particular donor audience and fully endorsed by the Conference of the Parties.

92. The importance of the Programme for conservation work on the ground and for promoting the profile of CMS in different countries and regions was stressed by a number of speakers. Ms Carrington enquired about project selection and fund allocation criteria, underlining Oceania's keen interest to benefit more from the Programme than it had done in the past. Mr Hepworth, replying, said that the future approach should be transparent and consistent with the targets and priorities set out under the Strategic Plan and with the need to achieve a regional balance.

93. The Chair said he took it that the Committee approved the report and wished to instruct the Secretariat to develop a comprehensive proposal on the CMS Small Grant programme in close consultation with the Chairman of the Scientific Council and to request the Scientific Council to produce at its next meeting a list of priority projects for which cost estimates existed to be implemented preferably in the period 2006-2008, subject to the availability of funding. It was so agreed.

#### **Agenda Item 10: 8th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties**

##### **Agenda Item 10(a): Cost and timetable of COP**

94. Mr Hepworth was pleased to report that the United Kingdom had pledged a further £50,000 in addition to the donation of \$45,000 mentioned in document CMS/StC28/10. As a result the shortfall between funds required and funds available had fallen to about \$180,000. He was hopeful that, as in the past, further donations would be forthcoming. UNEP/UNON was expected to contribute significant resources to the Conference, though the precise figure was still not known. The extent to which the Secretariat could subsidize travel expenses for delegates attending the COP would depend largely on how much funding was obtained.

95. Turning to the provisional timetable, he announced that an event associated with a Houbara Bustard agreement would be added to the programme if the consultations continued to make good progress. All Parties had been invited to produce posters for exhibition showing what they were doing to implement the Convention. The Secretariat was keen to receive further suggestions for side events from Parties and partners.

96. The Chair said he took it that the Committee wished to approve the budget and provisional timetable for COP8 on the understanding that the timetable was likely to change as the agenda developed. It was so agreed.

##### **Agenda Item 10(b): Funding CMS delegates at meetings**

97. Mr Hepworth drew attention to three different scenarios for funding for delegates and observers attending the COP set out in Annex 1(a) of document CMS/StC28/11. The number of Parties that

could be funded varied from 60 to 27 depending on the impact of the scenarios. He warned against adopting an overly restrictive policy on delegate funding since it might have the effect of excluding Parties from attending and causing the COP to shrink. Indeed, many of the Parties involved in the West African Elephant Agreement might not even be available to sign it. Ms Kanza added that the cost of scenarios 1 and 2 was far in excess of the \$225,000 envelope set for COP8, so that support from Parties and partners was essential to fill the gap. Mr Domashlinets said it was not clear to him whether scenario 2 excluded all the countries of central and eastern Europe or only those which had become members of the European Union, adding that the Czech Republic and Hungary had requested further assistance. Ms Carrington, speaking on behalf of Oceania, expressed a preference for scenario 1. She was opposed to sponsoring delegates from Parties with five or more years of unpaid contributions and to sponsoring delegates from non-parties more than once. Mr Williams suggested, by way of a compromise, that only EU Parties should be ineligible and, among non-EU countries, priority should be given to countries without arrears starting with the countries at the bottom of the United Nations scale and working upwards. Mr Schmitz (Germany) suggested cutting travel costs or the daily subsistence allowance for delegates from countries with payment arrears, a solution that would both save money and put added pressure on the Parties concerned to pay up. Mr Haffane pointed to a contradiction between CMS's drive to recruit new parties and the proposed new sanctions, which would effectively prevent those that had joined from attending meetings. A system of graduated penalties would be preferable. Mr Koyo warned against taking any action that might have the effect of severing the links between the developing countries and the CMS. Some mechanism must be found to secure the payment of arrears without shutting the door on the countries concerned. Mr El Kabiri suggested that the focal points in countries with unpaid pledges should be asked to ascertain that the authorities responsible for making payment actually knew where and how to make payment.

98. Mr Hepworth noted a clear difference of emphasis among members of the Committee which, while not unexpected, must be reconciled, as the Secretariat needed clear rules by which to organize the COP. One way of cutting costs would be for the Secretariat to pre-book hotel accommodation and seek savings on air travel. As far as penalties were concerned, under an existing rule Parties which were three or more years in arrears of payment were barred from voting at the COP. That rule had been applied in the past and would be applied again. He suggested that EU countries requiring assistance should apply to the European Commission. In that case, said Mr Domashlinets, newcomers to the EU should be informed well in advance that they were no longer eligible for CMS support, to allow them time to make their applications.

99. Summing up discussion, Mr Hepworth said the Committee appeared to favour the following order of priority for allocation of funding: (i) the poorest non-EU countries with no unpaid CMS pledges in ascending order of GDP up to the 0.2 threshold; (ii) the poorest countries with unpaid CMS pledges in ascending order of GDP up to the 0.2 threshold; (iii) non-party developing countries which had not previously received a subsidy to attend a CMS COP. He gave an assurance that no more than the \$225,000 limit set by COP7 would be taken from the Trust Fund; any further subsidies would have to come from earmarked contributions. It was suggested that an exception should be made under (iv) for non-parties which in the judgment of the Secretariat were well advanced along the road to joining CMS.

100. The Chair said the approach outlined by Mr Hepworth appeared to be the fairest one and he asked whether it was the wish of the Committee to proceed on that basis. It was so agreed.

#### **Agenda Item 10(c): Draft Agenda**

101. The Committee was asked to consider the proposed draft agenda for COP8 (UNEP/CMS/Conf.8.1). Mr Hepworth drew attention to some minor changes in the way the business had been divided up compared with previous COP agendas which were intended to make the agenda more logical and to give prominence to the Strategic Plan. An item on CMS outreach and communications had been added. Furthermore, a firm distinction had been made between Appendix I and Appendix II species. The draft was agreed.

#### **Agenda Item 10 (d): National reports**

102. Mr Rilla Manta said the Secretariat had sent out reminders to Parties to submit their national reports by the deadline of 20 May 2005. Only one report, from Monaco, had been received to date. He appealed to regional representatives to jog the memories of the Parties in their regions, pointing out that national reports formed the basis of the synoptic report prepared by the Secretariat for the COP in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC.

#### **Agenda Item 11: Date and venue of 29th and 30th Meetings of the Standing Committee**

103. Referring to the provisional timetable for COP8 contained in Annex 2 of CMS/StC28/10, Mr Hepworth said that a period of two hours had provisionally been reserved for the 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee on 20 November 2005 immediately prior to the opening ceremony of COP8. However, since the meeting would fulfil the function of a 'Bureau' for the COP, it was agreed to make provision for the meeting, if necessary, to continue longer. The 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting would take place immediately after the COP, on 25 November 2005, and would have the task of electing a Chairman, determining the date of the next substantive meeting and setting priority topics for it. The Committee requested the Secretariat to make arrangements accordingly.

#### **Agenda Item 12: Any other business**

104. Implications of UNECE draft guidelines relating to the implementation of a provision of the Aarhus Convention

105. Mr Williams said that the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters ("Aarhus Convention") of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) contained a provision requiring parties to promote the application of its principles (improve public access to environmental information; public participation in decision-making; and access to justice in environmental matters) within other international fora including MEAs. To help achieve that, UNECE was drawing up guidelines which would be politically binding and were to be finalized and possibly adopted at the Second Meeting of the Parties in Almaty in May 2005. The Standing Committee might want to express to UNECE its wish to have an opportunity at least to consider the final text and the implications for CMS before the guidelines were finally adopted, even though they might turn out to be completely benign. Members of the Committee expressed their unease that the whole constituency of CMS might be affected indirectly, if not directly, if it was agreed through UNECE that any individual could have access to any forum to discuss any environmental, developmental or economic matter. One Member made the point that the aim of restricted participation at meetings was not to exclude anyone but to create conditions conducive to the efficient conduct of business. The Chair said the draft guidelines would probably be remitted to a committee which would be asked to consider the implications for a range of MEAs. He offered to communicate through colleagues in the United Kingdom to the Second Meeting of the Parties in Almaty the Standing Committee's wish to have more time to examine the proposal.

#### **Agenda Item 13: Closure of the meeting**

106. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 3:30 p.m. on Friday, 22 April 2005.



## 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee

*Bonn, 21-22 April 2005*

CMS/StC28/Inf.8/Rev. 2

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<b>Chair:</b>	United Kingdom (Europe)	Mr. Eric Blencowe
<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Morocco (Africa)	Mr. Mohamed Haffane
<b>Members:</b>	Germany (Depositary)	Mr. Dirk Schwenzfeier Mr. Joachim Schmitz Ms. Nicola Breier
	Kenya (Africa)	Mr. Anderson Koyo
	Sri Lanka (Asia)	Ms. Asarappulige Chandani Wilson
	Ukraine (Europe)	Dr. Volodymyr Domashlinets
	United Kingdom (Europe)	Mr. Andrew Williams
	Australia (Oceania)	Ms. Alison Carrington
<b>Observers:</b>	Monaco	Mr. Patrick van Klaveren
	Switzerland	Dr. Olivier Biber
	CMS Scientific Council, Chair	Mr. Christoph Imboden
	BirdLife International	Prof. Dr. Colin Galbraith
	WDCS	Mr. John O'Sullivan Ms. Margi Prideaux
<b>Secretariats of CMS Agreements:</b>	AEWA	Mr. Bert Lenten
	EUROBATS	Mr. Andreas Streit
<b>UNEP/CMS Secretariat:</b>	Executive Secretary	Mr. Robert Hepworth
	Deputy Executive Secretary	Mr. Moulay Lahcen El Kabiri
	Agreements Officer	Mr. Lyle Glowka
	Scientific and Technical Support Officer	Mr. Marco Barbieri
	Information and Capacity-Building Officer	Mr. Francisco Rilla Manta
	Inter-Agency Liaison Officer	Ms. Paola Deda
	Administrative/Fund Management Officer	Ms. Jasmin Kanza
<b>Report Writer</b>	Ms Suzanne George	
<b>Meeting Secretariat:</b>	Mr Liam Addis	Ms Jeanybeth Mina
	Ms Heidrun Frisch	Ms Patricia Nolan-Moss
	Mr Jochen Hilker	Mr Nalanda Wijeratne
	Mr Abderrahmane Jai	Mr. Helge Weinberg

## **28<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee**

*Bonn, 21-22 April 2005*

---

CMS/StC28/1-E

### **PROVISIONAL AGENDA**

1. Opening remarks and introductions
2. Confirmation of Rules of Procedure (unchanged from 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting)
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. Adoption of reports of the 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting
5. Secretariat's report on CMS inter-sessional activities since 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting (verbal)
6. Reports from Standing Committee members and observers (including Chair of Scientific Council)
7. Sahelo-Saharan Antelope Project: Progress
8. Resources
  - a) Secretariat Manpower and Organisation
  - b) Status of CMS Budget 2003-2005
  - c) Fundraising Project: Interim Report
  - d) Report of the Budget Working Group for next triennium (2006-2008)
9. Planning
  - a) Strategic Plan:
    - i) Implementation of Existing Plan
    - ii) Report of the Working Group
  - b) CMS and the 2010 Biodiversity Targets
10. 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
  - a) Costs of COP
  - b) Funding for delegates and observers
  - c) Draft Agenda
11. Date and venue of 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> Meetings of the Standing Committee
12. Any other business and closure



# CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

Distr: GENERAL

UNEP/CMS/COP.8/Report  
Annex V

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

## REPORT OF THE TWENTY-NINTH MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE

### I. OPENING REMARKS

1. The twenty-ninth meeting of the Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) took place on Sunday, 20 November 2005 in Nairobi, Kenya.
2. The meeting was opened at 10.20 a.m. by the Chair, Mr. Martin Brasher, head of the Global Wildlife Division of the United Kingdom Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. In his opening remarks, the Chair expressed pleasure that, at the time of the meeting, there were 93 Parties to the Convention, indicative of the global commitment to the conservation of migratory species. He commented that, when he had held the same post 15 years earlier, there had been only about 25–30 Parties. The purpose of the meeting of the Standing Committee was to prepare for the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention during the coming week.

### II. ATTENDANCE

3. A full list of participants is contained in annex 1 to this report.

### III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA, SCHEDULE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE

4. The Committee adopted its agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda prepared by the Secretariat, which had been circulated in document CMS/StC29/1/Rev.1. The adopted agenda is contained in Annex 2 to this report.
5. The Chair said that the agenda constituted the schedule for the meeting and suggested timings to ensure that the Committee completed its business on time. The rules of procedure, as circulated in document CMS/StC/Inf.1, were also adopted.

### IV. CMS BUDGET AND EXPENDITURE 2003–2005: REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT

6. Mr. Robert Hepworth, Executive Secretary of CMS, introducing the item on behalf of the Secretariat, observed that the purpose of the agenda item and the closely related item 4 was to deal transparently with outstanding management and financial business for the current triennium

(2003–2005). He introduced document CMS/StC29/4, containing financial data on the budget and expenditure of CMS in the triennium.

7. Ms. Jasmin Kanza, Financial Officer for the Secretariat, said that the document, which updated information presented at the twenty-eighth meeting of the Standing Committee in Bonn, 21-22 April 2005, gave details of actual and projected expenditure for the current triennium, and compared expenditure against the budget approved at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

8. She expressed satisfaction that the Convention was on a sounder financial footing following some difficulties in recent years. Costs had been maintained to within the approved budget for the triennium, though a draw-down from the operating reserve was foreseen. Annex I of the document, showing actual expenditure in 2003 and 2004 and projected expenditure until the end of 2005, was unchanged from the information paper initially presented at Bonn. Annex II focused on 2005 and showed the current status of the trust fund; the forecast for 2005 indicated a balance of \$82,388. Annex III, listing receivables, revealed that unpaid pledges totalled \$498,586. The balance sheet (annex IV) showed reserves at the end of the period of \$821, in addition to the \$700,000 mandatory operating reserve.

9. In summary, the Secretariat had spent what it had been commissioned to spend over the accounting period. There was no substantial surplus to carry forward to the forthcoming triennium, but the operating reserve remained intact at \$700,000.

10. Mr. Hepworth noted that a proposal would be considered at the Conference of the Parties to reduce the statutory reserve, releasing \$200,000 if so decided by the Parties. It was difficult to assess the precise financial situation at the end of 2005, but there would be little to carry over for active expenditure during the coming triennium – a normal situation for United Nations bodies, but unusual for CMS.

11. He observed that the financial position outlined in the budget document was based on the assumption that the unpaid pledges listed in annex III had been paid. The Committee urged the payment of those pledges, the largest of which was nearly \$200,000.

12. Mr. Anderson Koyo, the representative for Africa, enquired what action had been taken on unpaid pledges, and asked for more information on the incorporation of additional voluntary contributions into the budget.

13. Mr. Hepworth said that at the political level, the Secretariat had been assiduous in following up the matter of unpaid pledges, and the situation, though remaining unsatisfactory, had improved since the Bonn meeting in April. Regarding additional voluntary contributions, one general contribution of \$40,000 from the United Nations Environment Project (UNEP), towards the cost of delegates to the Convention, was shown in the budget. Other contributions were expected to be completely expended – almost all were earmarked for specific projects. There was little chance of that source generating significant additional resources.

14. Ms. Kanza added that the Secretariat did not invoice on earmarked contributions, which were given on goodwill for specific purposes. Invoices for assessed contributions were submitted to focal points thrice yearly.

15. Ms. Rosario Acero Villanes, the representative for the Americas region, speaking on behalf of Argentina, requested an update on Argentina's request for reconsideration of its scale of contributions. Mr. Hepworth replied that the scale applied was the United Nations scale, as

agreed to in the General Assembly, and could not be changed, unless the Parties decided to develop a different method of assessment. He added that following recent discussion with Argentina, he was optimistic that a considerable payment would soon be made.

16. The Chair, in summary, thanked the Secretariat for its work in preparing the budget, and expressed satisfaction at the achievement of a positive balance, while noting the still fragile situation regarding unpaid pledges.

## **V. CMS STRATEGIC PLAN 2000–2005: REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT**

17. Mr. Lyle Glowka, Agreements Officer of the Secretariat, provided an overview of the implementation of the CMS strategic plans covering two trienniums over the period 2000–2005. A tabular report summarizing the achievements in this area was presented in document CMS/StC29/3. Mr. Glowka first noted that since the Strategic Plan for 2000–2002 had been approved at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 1999 a number of measures had been undertaken to help assess implementation. The indicators fell into two categories: indirect measures, which were essentially process oriented, and direct measures, which focused on conservation impacts. Together, these had served as the basis for performance reviews that had been presented both to the Standing Committee and to the Conference of the Parties at its last meeting.

18. He explained that the monitoring and evaluation exercise had been conducted internally, without the support of external consultants. Collaboration with the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) had been considered but was precluded by budgetary limitations. As a result, the review had focused primarily on process-related outcomes, relating to the 133 activities that had been undertaken under the auspices of the Strategic Plan.

19. The activities fell into four categories associated with the core objectives of the Strategic Plan. These objectives were: (a) to promote the conservation of migratory species included in the major animal groups listed in the CMS appendices; (b) to focus and prioritize conservation actions for migratory species; (c) to enhance global membership of CMS through targeted promotion of the Convention's aim; and (d) to facilitate and improve implementation of the Convention.

20. The most progress had been made against the last of these criteria. A 97 per cent engagement rate had been achieved in the 34 activities listed under this objective, meaning that some action had been taken in 97 per cent of those activities and that some had already progressed to completion. The second most successful area related to objective 1 (promoting conservation), where a 72 per cent engagement level had been achieved. This was taken to indicate the usefulness of the CMS small grant programme.

21. When objective 2 (focusing conservation action) was concerned, implementation had been less impressive, with a 50 per cent engagement during the two trienniums under consideration. Results within the group of objective 3 (enhancing global membership) activities were weaker still, although it was noted that this comprised only three activities. Moreover, while attempts to attract priority countries to join CMS had enjoyed very limited success, 28 other States had become members over the review period and a number of memoranda of understanding had extended the non-Party membership in the wider CMS family.

22. Subsequent discussion focused on the desirability of extending the review process to evaluation of conservation outcomes. Mr. Colin Galbraith, Chair of the Scientific Council, noted

that the Council had found conservation outcomes to be poor, particularly in relation to species listed in Appendix I. There was a need to link process evaluation to conservation outcomes, and in that regard CMS could serve as an example to other conventions working with conservation issues.

23. Mr. Koyo supported this observation, noting that it was vital for CMS to demonstrate the impact of its actions on the conservation of migratory species to people at national and local levels. A more abstract evaluation of processes could prove very useful at the international and regional levels but needed to translate into a change in the status of migratory species on the ground. Mr. Koyo asked whether the Secretariat had any plans to extend the evaluation process to include more conservation measures.

24. While the Chair reminded the Committee that such matters were a matter for discussion by the Conference of the Parties, the Secretariat was able to provide some information on that issue. The standard of monitoring depended heavily on the information resources at the Secretariat's disposal. The proposed Strategic Plan for the triennium 2006–2008, however, had been structured in a more measurable way than its predecessors, with a closer link between processes and conservation issues. It was also hoped that the CMS Information Management System would increasingly provide access to the data needed for evaluation of conservation work.

25. With respect to the evaluation of the activities of the Scientific Council, Dr. Galbraith explained that the Council had adopted an implementation plan for its work, which was aligned with the Strategic Plan. It could be modified if the Strategic Plan were adjusted by the Conference of the Parties. The implementation plan included a number of indicators that should help ensure that the Council's conservation work was more thoroughly evaluated in the future.

26. Summarizing the position of the Committee on the issue, the Chair thanked the Secretariat for its work and noted that the Committee did not want conservation outcomes to be subordinated to consideration of processes.

27. Ms. Robyn Bromley, the representative for Oceania, enquired whether the Secretariat would welcome comments on the document summarizing progress in implementation (CMS/StC29/3). Mr. Hepworth expressed gratitude for the offer, but said that time constraints meant that such points would be best raised at the Conference of the Parties.

28. Finally, Mr. Andreas Streit, the representative of EUROBATS, highlighted his organization's appearance in the tabular report on implementation (CMS/StC29/3) and expressed optimism that the Conference of the Parties would approve a similar agreement aimed at bat conservation in Africa.

## **VI. LOGISTICAL ARRANGEMENTS AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

### **A. Meeting structure: committees, working groups and chairs and vice-chairs**

29. Mr. Hepworth provided an outline of the basic structure of the Conference of the Parties, noting that it would follow a format similar to that of previous such events. He explained that the structure would include a plenary meeting, a Committee of the Whole, a credentials committee, and a budget working group, which had been renamed the Resources Working Group in order to differentiate it from the intersessional budget working group and would report directly to the plenary meeting. Further working groups would be formed on an ad hoc basis to discuss specific issues.

30. Mr. Hepworth noted that several Parties to the Convention had expressed willingness to chair the various conference meetings. Specifically, Monaco had offered to chair plenary sessions, the Seychelles the Committee of the Whole, and Kenya the Resources Working Group. It was noted that the selection of chairs and vice-chairs would be taken following formal nomination at the conference, and the Chair invited representatives to consider assuming responsibility for such nominations.

31. During the subsequent discussion, the representative of the Americas nominated Roberto Schlatter, President of the Institute of Zoology, Universidad Austral, Chile, to serve as Vice-Chair of the Committee of the Whole. The Standing Committee also supported a proposal made by Mr. Koyo that efforts be made to encourage one of the Convention's major financial contributors to seek the vice-chairmanship of the resources working group.

32. On the composition of working groups, it was agreed that they should be as inclusive as possible. There was some discussion of membership of the resources working group, focused primarily on the suitability of inviting non-governmental organizations to participate. In that context, it was noted that rule 23 of the rules of procedure for the Conference of the Parties provided that an invitation to observers to attend a working group rested with the chair of that meeting. Representatives of Oceania and Germany, who had expressed a preference that the decision be conferred to the Conference of the Parties, felt that an attempt to alter the rules would be inappropriate.

#### **B. Deployment of Secretariat resources during the Conference of the Parties**

33. Mr. Hepworth noted the existence of a document entitled "How can we assist you?", which outlined the responsibilities of Secretariat members and gave brief details of their location during the conference.

#### **C. Conference timetable including side events**

34. In considering the item, the Committee had before it document UNEP/CMS/Conf.8.2/Rev.2. Mr. Hepworth noted that the timetable for the conference was very tight; any failure to adhere to the proposed schedule might necessitate the use of evening sessions, which would have budgetary implications.

#### **D. Opening ceremony**

35. Mr. Hepworth briefly summarized the proposed schedule and arrangements for the opening ceremony of the conference. It was noted that the existing documentation omitted the participation of the Kenyan Minister for Tourism and Wildlife.

#### **E. Rules of procedure (amendments)**

36. Mr. Moulay Lachen El Kabiri, Deputy Executive Secretary of CMS, provided a review of the proposed rules of procedure for the eighth Conference of the Parties, as outlined in document UNEP/CMS/Conf.8.4/Rev.2 and Corr. He noted that the rules remained virtually unchanged from those adopted at the seventh Conference of the Parties, although two matters required discussion. The first concerned the list of countries whose contributions stood in arrears and is discussed in more detail below.

37. The second related to the proposed creation of a new rule 12 on the submission of resolutions and recommendations to the Conference of the Parties. In response to a query regarding the need for the change, he explained that the proposed requirement for parties to submit resolutions 60 days prior to a meeting was designed to facilitate the Secretariat's work, particularly in view of the increase in the Convention's membership. The change would also bring practice into line with that of other conventions, for example the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species.

#### **F. Voting eligibility (document: UNEP/CMS/Conf.8.4/Rev.2 and Corr.)**

38. Mr. El Kabiri noted that a number of countries stood in arrears of over three years with their assessed contributions and were therefore liable to lose their right to vote at the conference under rule 15.2 of the draft rules of procedure. He explained that five countries, namely Argentina, Congo, Morocco, Nigeria and Uruguay, had been removed from the list of countries at risk of losing voting rights because the Secretariat had received satisfactory assurances from those States that they would make a payment. Sixteen Parties remained on the list. Most of those were African countries and were at risk of losing their right to vote.

39. Mr. Koyo voiced concern about the consequences of applying punitive measures to the countries concerned. While stressing that he did not condone the failure of those Parties to meet their obligations, he noted that some decisions that might be voted on could directly affect the disenfranchised countries. The effect could be to reduce the commitment of important range States to the implementation of the decisions.

40. In response, Mr. Hepworth noted that, while the Committee was free to advise the Conference of the Parties on the application of rule 15.2, the decision rested with the Conference of the Parties. He also reminded the Committee that in a resolution adopted at its seventh meeting, the Conference of the Parties had voiced its desire that rule 15.2 be strictly applied.

41. Following some discussion, the Committee approved a compromise proposal put forward by Mr. El Kabiri. It agreed to recommend to the Conference of the Parties that countries in arrears be given the opportunity to provide the Secretariat with compelling evidence that they intended to make a payment to explain the extraordinary circumstances which justified non-payment. Any such submissions should be provided in writing to the Bureau for the Conference. The proposal was in line with the approach taken regarding the five States already removed from the list of those facing denial of voting rights.

42. The proposal was welcomed by the Chair and by several other Committee members. The representative of Ukraine informed the Committee that his country had already submitted an explanation of its accumulation of arrears and a commitment to pay them.

## **VII. ROLE FOR STANDING COMMITTEE MEMBERS DURING THE EIGHTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES**

### **A. Regional consultations during the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties**

43. Mr. Hepworth said that rooms would be available for the CMS regions to allow the delegations to hold consultations.

## **B. Facilitation of the preparation and sponsorship of resolutions and recommendations**

44. Mr. Hepworth said that this agenda item had been put on the agenda because many papers on future agreements had been submitted by delegations to the Conference of the Parties. The Secretariat would do everything possible to support contact groups, and rooms would be made available to them. The Secretariat had taken a more proactive position by preparing an informal paper on the implementation of existing agreements and development of future agreements. A contact group could be set up to prepare an umbrella resolution on future agreements. The Chair commended the preparation of the non-paper. It was agreed that the Secretariat should circulate it to the Conference of the Parties as a draft.

45. Mr. Koyo asked if the papers had been read and approved by the Scientific Council. He said that the papers should include the necessary scientific content. Responding to that concern, Dr. Galbraith pointed out that the report of the Council to the Conference of the Parties would cover recommendations and that a resolution had been drafted on future agreements. The scientific content of the resolution had been approved. Mr. Glowka pointed out that at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties a consolidated resolution on future agreements had been adopted. He recommended that the draft resolution be circulated in all languages.

## **C. Canvassing possible host countries for the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties**

46. Mr. Hepworth pointed out that some countries had made late offers to host the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. He said that holding a meeting of the Scientific Council immediately before the Conference of the Parties was not necessarily the best arrangement. He said that doing so increased costs for the host country considerably. He felt that the host country should be asked to merely host the Conference of the Parties. Dr. Galbraith agreed that separation of the meeting of the Scientific Council and the Conference of the Parties would be advisable in order to allow the Scientific Council's report to be circulated, and its content properly absorbed, in advance of the meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

## **VIII. INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS (BRIEF INTRODUCTION, ONLY TO ISSUES)**

### **A. Standing Committee: New members, alternates**

47. The Chair pointed out that no country needed to step down from the Standing Committee because each member could serve two terms. He said that, within their regional groups, countries should be ready to appoint new representatives or re-elect the existing ones. He reminded the meeting that the regional members of the Standing Committee were not elected by the Conference of the Parties but by the regions. Nevertheless he agreed with the point that it would be better if all the Committee members did not step down at the same time and he asked the regional representatives to bear that point in mind.

### **B. Future structure and chairmanship of intersessional committees**

48. Mr. Hepworth observed that this issue had been mentioned in connection with the Scientific Council. He explained that the annex to conference document 8.19 listed a number of economic measures that could be taken, particularly as regards the Scientific Council, which if adopted could affect the way the Council conducts its business. The issue of the chairmanship of

intersessional committees was for those committees to decide. The new Standing Committee would elect its chair for the next intersessional period when it convened.

## **IX. MATTERS RELATING TO THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL**

### **A. Report on the outcome of the election of the Chair and Vice-Chair**

49. Reporting on the meeting of the Scientific Council held from 16 to 18 November, Dr. Colin Galbraith said that the meeting had been well attended and had looked at, among other things, the CMS strategic plan, proposals for listing of species and resolutions and recommendations related to climate change.

50. Mr. John Mshelbwala of Nigeria had been elected as the new Chair; Dr. Colin Galbraith and Dr. Pierre Devillers had been elected joint Vice-Chairs.

51. The Chair commended Dr. Galbraith on his report and said that there would be a fuller report and discussion at the Conference of the Parties. Mr. Koyo asked whether the Scientific Council had made proposals and recommendations and circulated them to the Parties and if so, whether any Parties had responded. Dr. Galbraith noted that all taxonomic issues had been discussed substantively and recommendations would be made to the Conference of the Parties.

### **B. Councillors appointed by the Conference of the Parties (new appointments and re-appointments)**

52. The Council took note that Dr. Pierre Pfeiffer, conference appointed Councillor for large mammals, and Dr. Noritaka Ichida, conference appointed Councillor for Asiatic fauna had indicated their desire to retire. The Chair had been mandated to write letters of appreciation to them. The Council had recommended the appointment of Dr. Taej Mundkur as new appointed Councillor for Asiatic fauna while the appointment of a new Councillor for large mammals had not been considered necessary as council membership included already the desired expertise.

53. The Council had recommended the appointment of a Councillor for African fauna and a Councillor for large fishes. It had been recommended that Mr. Barry Baker of Australia should continue overseeing work on by-catch until the possible appointment of a conference appointed Councillor for by-catch, as recommended by draft Res.8.14.

## **X. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

54. Mr. Hepworth requested that the report of the last meeting of the Standing Committee should be noted.

## **XI. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

55. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 1.05 p.m. on Saturday, 20 November 2005.

**TWENTY-NINTH MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE**

*Nairobi, 20 November 2005*

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES\***

**Chairman/Président/President:**

United Kingdom (Europe)

Mr. Martin Brasher

**Vice-Chairman/Vice-Président/Vice-presidente:**

Morocco (Africa) (Apology)

**Members/Membres/Miembros:**

Germany (Depositary)

Mr. Dirk Schwenzfeier

Mr. Joachim Schmitz

Kenya (Africa)

Mr. Anderson Koyo

Peru (Americas)

Ms. Rosario Acero Villanes

Sri Lanka (Asia) (Apology)

Ukraine (Europe)

Mr. Volodymyr Domashlinets

United Kingdom (Europe)

Prof. Dr. Colin Galbraith

Australia (Oceania)

Ms. Robyn Bromley

**Observers/Observateurs/Observadores:**

Bangladesh

Mr. Tapan Kumar Dey

Ecuador

Ms. Gabriela Montoya

Eritrea

Mr. Tekleab Mesghena

France

Mr. Yacob Y. Ifter

Monaco

Mr. Olivier Dehorter

New Zealand

Mr. Patrick van Klaveren

Nigeria

Dr. Michael F. Donoghue

Pakistan

Mr. John H. Mshelbwala

Philippines

Mr. S.Z. Hussain

Seychelles

Mr. Antonio C. Manila

Tajikistan

Mr. Rolph Payet

Yemen

Dr. Alikhon Latifi

Mr. M.A. Abdulraheem

CMS Scientific Council, Chair

Mr. G. H. Al-Harogi

Prof. Dr. Colin Galbraith

Mr. John Mshelbwala

**CMS Agreements / Accords CMS / CMS Acuerdos:**

ACCOBAMS

Dr. Marie-Christine van Klaveren

AEWA

Mr. Bert Lenten

EUROBATS

Mr. Andreas Streit

**CMS Secretariat / Secretariat CMS / Secretaría CMS:**

Executive Secretary

Mr. Robert Hepworth

Deputy Executive Secretary

Mr. Moulay Lachen El Kabiri

Agreements Officer

Mr. Lyle Glowka

Scientific and Technical Support Officer

Dr. Marco Barbieri

Information and Capacity-Building Officer

Dr. Francisco Rilla Manta

Inter-Agency Liaison Officer

Ms. Paola Deda

Administrative/Fund Management Officer

Ms. Jasmin Kanza

---

\* The alphabetic order follows the order of English country short names. / L'ordre alphabétique suit l'ordre des noms abrégés des pays en anglais. / El orden alfabético sigue el orden de las abreviaturas de los nombres de países en Inglés.

**TWENTY-NINTH MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE**  
*Nairobi, 20 November 2005*

**AGENDA**

1. Opening remarks
2. Adoption of the agenda, schedule and rules of procedure (CMS/StC29/2)
3. CMS Budget and Expenditure 2003-2005 – Report by the Secretariat (Financial data in CMS/StC29/4)
4. CMS Strategic Plan 2000-2005: Report by Secretariat (Tabular report in CMS/StC29/3)
5. COP8 logistical arrangements and procedural matters
  - a. Meeting structure: Committees, working groups and Chairs/Vice Chairs
  - b. Deployment of Secretariat resources during COP
  - c. Conference timetable including side events  
(Documents: UNEP/CMS/Conf.8.1/Rev.3; UNEP/CMS/Conf.8.2/Rev.2)
  - d. Opening ceremony
  - e. Rules of procedure (Amendments)  
(Document: UNEP/CMS/Conf.8.4/Rev.2 + Corr.)
  - f. Voting eligibility  
(Document: UNEP/CMS/Conf.8.4/Rev.2 + Corr.)
6. Role for Standing Committee members during COP8
  - a. Regional consultations during COP8
  - b. Facilitation of the preparation and sponsorship of Resolutions and Recommendations
  - c. Canvassing possible host countries for COP9
7. Institutional matters (brief introduction, only to issues)
  - a. Standing Committee: New members, alternates
  - b. Future structure and chairmanship of inter-sessional committees
8. Matters relating to the Scientific Council
  - a. Report on outcome of the election of Chair and Vice-Chair
  - b. COP-appointed councillors (new appointments/re-appointments)
9. Any other business

**CONVENTION ON  
MIGRATORY  
SPECIES**

Distr: GENERAL

UNEP/CMS/COP.8/Report  
Annex VI

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**REPORT OF THE THIRTIETH MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE****I. OPENING REMARKS**

1. The thirtieth meeting of the Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) took place on Friday, 25 November 2005 in Nairobi, Kenya.
2. The meeting was opened by Mr. Robert Hepworth, Executive Secretary of CMS and provisional Chair of the Standing Committee, at 17:45 hrs. He noted that the meeting had three core objectives: election of officials to fill the posts of Chair and Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee during the triennium 2006–2008; selection of a date for the next Committee meeting; and consideration of the issue of new appointments to the Scientific Council. A formal agenda was not adopted.

**II. ATTENDANCE**

3. A full list of participants is contained in the annex to the present report.

**III. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR OF THE STANDING  
COMMITTEE FOR THE TRIENNIUM 2006-2008**

4. Mr. Hepworth invited representatives to submit nominations for the post of Chair of the Standing Committee. Mr. Oliver Schall (Depositary) proposed that the United Kingdom continue to serve as Chair, a role which it had fulfilled during the triennium 2003–2005. Dr. Hany Tatwany (Saudi Arabia) seconded the nomination. The United Kingdom accepted and was duly appointed as chair of the Standing Committee for the period 2006–2008.
5. Mr. Martin Brasher (United Kingdom), assumed the chairmanship of the meeting. He asked representatives to make nominations for the post of Vice-Chair. Mr. Schall nominated Australia and the proposal was seconded by Ms. Rosario Acero (Peru). Australia accepted and was appointed as Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee for the triennium 2006–2008.

**IV. DATE OF THE 31<sup>ST</sup> MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE**

6. Mr. Brasher noted the need to decide a date for the next meeting of the Standing Committee, pointing out that the budgetary decisions made by Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting meant that this would take place in 2007 at the earliest. It was agreed that the CMS Secretariat should identify a date in January or February 2007 for the 31<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee.

## **V. APPOINTMENT OF NEW SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL MEMBERS**

7. Mr. Brasher introduced the final issue for discussion, which concerned the appointment of three new appointed councillors to the Scientific Council. He noted that the Conference of the Parties had decided at its eighth meeting to confer responsibility for those appointments onto the Standing Committee so that contracting parties would have sufficient time to make nominations to the posts. However, that decision effectively implied delaying the appointments until the next Standing Committee meeting in early 2007, which meant denying the Convention the benefit of their work for a long period.

8. In view of the concerns expressed by Standing Committee members about the consequences of delays, it was agreed that the appointments process should be expedited through the use of postal nominations. The Committee would ask the secretariat to make an appeal to contracting parties for the submission of nominations via electronic mail. These would go before the Scientific Council for comments before the Standing Committee selected candidates, again through electronic mail correspondence.

## **VI. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

9. After the customary exchange of courtesies, Mr. Brasher declared the meeting closed at 18:05 on 25 November 2005.

**THIRTIETH MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES\***

**Chairman/Président/President:**

United Kingdom (Europe)

Mr. Martin Brasher

**Vice-Chairman/Vice-Président/Vice-presidente:**

Australia (Oceania)

Ms. Robyn Bromley

**Members/Membres/Miembros or/ou/en**

**Alternate Members/Suppléants Membres/Suplentes Miembros:**

Chad (Francophone Africa)

Mr. Mahamat Hassane Idriss

Germany (Depositary)

Mr. Oliver Schall

New Zealand (Oceania)

Dr. Mike Donoghue

Peru (Americas and Caribbean)

Ms. Rosario Acero

Saudi Arabia (Asia)

Dr. Hany Tatwany

Tanzania (Anglophone Africa)

Mr. Emmanuel Severre

Mr. Charles Mdoe

Mr. Mzamilu Kaitu

**Observers/Observateurs/Observadores:**

Nigeria

Mr. John Mschelbwala

**CMS Secretariat / Secretariat CMS / Secretaría CMS:**

Executive Secretary

Mr. Robert Hepworth

Deputy Executive Secretary

Mr. Moulay Lahcen El Kabiri

Agreements Officer

Mr. Lyle Glowka

Administrative / Fund Management Officer

Ms. Jasmin Kanza

S:\WorkingDocs\COP8\COP8\REPORT COP8\Annex\_VI\_SIC30\_Report\_E.doc

---

\* The alphabetic order follows the order of English country short names. / L'ordre alphabétique suit l'ordre des noms abrégés des pays en anglais. / El orden alfabético sigue el orden de las abreviaturas de los nombres de países en Inglés.